

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed March 5, 2007. Claims 1-8 and 15-21 were previously cancelled. Claims 9 and 22 are amended. Claims 9-14 and 22-28 remain pending in view of the above amendments.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. The remarks or lack of remarks herein are not to be construed as an admission as to the purported teachings of the cited art or as an admission of the Examiner's interpretation of the cited art. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Specification

The Examiner objected to pages 7 and 8 as incorrectly listing reference numeral 350 when reference numeral 370 was intended. Appropriate correction has been made as presented in the Amendments to the Specification section of this response.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 9-14 and 22-28 as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0064193 (*Diaz*) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0138008 (*Riaziat*). Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection for obviousness on the grounds that the references – either individually or in combination – fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims.

Embodiments of the application relate to a laser driver. Claim 9 has been amended to clarify that the first PNP transistor current source and the second PNP

transistor current source are coupled, via the first and second inductors, to different sides of the laser diode. Claim 9 clarifies that the positions of the switches can result in a first current or a second current delivered to the laser diode, in part because the first and second PNP transistor current sources are coupled to opposite sides of the laser diode.

Although the Office Action suggests that *Diaz* teaches a first and second current, there is no teaching in *Diaz* that the first and second currents are provided by the combination of a first PNP transistor current source, a second PNP transistor current source, and a current sink.

As noted in the Office Action, *Diaz* does not disclose an additional PNP current source and inductor to be coupled to the second switch, or the laser diode to be driven differentially. The Office Action attempts to overcome this deficiency by suggesting that *Riaziat* teaches a differentially driven laser diode. While *Riaziat* does mention a differential drive approach, there is no suggestion of what components are needed in a differential drive approach.

Because *Riaziat*'s fails to disclose the components needed in a differential driver and only mentions a differentially driven approach, the Office Action thus relies on MPEP 2144(VI)(B), which states that the duplication of parts has no patentable significance. The Office Action then concludes that it would have been obvious to couple an additional identical PNP current mirror and inductor to the second switch. See Office Action at Page 5.

Applicants respectfully traverse for several reasons. First, Applicants do not believe that the duplication of parts as explained in MPEP 2144(VI)(B) applies. More particularly, MPEP 2144(VI)(B) discusses a water seal, which has a plurality of ribs projecting outwardly from each side of the web into one of the adjacent concrete slabs. In this case, each of the ribs projects outwardly from each side of the web into an adjacent concrete slab. Thus, the duplication of ribs, each of which projects into an adjacent concrete slab, has no patentable significance.

The first and second PNP transistor current sources, in contrast to the ribs discussed in MPEP 2144(VI)(B), do not couple to the same structure. Rather, the first

and second PNP transistor current sources couple, via the first and second inductors, to different sides of the laser diode. This configuration results in different (a first and a second) currents. Because the first and second PNP transistor current sources are coupled to opposite sides of a laser diode and because two different currents result based on the states of the first and second switches, MPEP 2144(VI)(B) does not appear to apply in this instance.

Further, as noted in the Office Action, *Diaz* does not disclose an additional PNP current source and inductor to be coupled to the second switch, or the laser diode to be driven differentially.

For at least these reasons, the Office Action has not demonstrated that the combination of *Diaz* and *Riazat* discloses each and every element of claim 1 and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. Claim 22 is believed to be patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. The dependent claims are also patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended and currently pending are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 5th day of July, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carl T. Reed/ Reg. #45454

CARL T. REED

CARL T. REED

Registration No. 45,454

Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

Telephone: (801) 533-9800